

**R E M A R K S**

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Applicant's representative respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the arguments presented in the Response filed on April 22, 2005. Specifically, MPEP §707.07(f) states:

Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it.

Applicant traversed (i) the rejection claims 1-3, 15-17, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,158,014), (ii) the rejection of claims 4, 5 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Henson in view of the background section of the present application and (iii) the rejection of claims 6-13, 18-21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Henson in view of Jones (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,682). The Office Action mailed July 6, 2005 repeats the rejections traversed by the Applicant (see section 3 on page 2 of the Office Action mailed July 6, 2005). Applicant's representative presented arguments supporting the traversals with respect to both independent and dependent claims. The Office Action mailed July 6, 2005 does not take note of the arguments presented and does not address or answer the substance of each argument as required by MPEP §707.07(f). Applicant's representative respectfully requests

the Examiner withdraw the finality of the Office Action mailed July 6, 2005, reconsider the arguments presented in the Response filed April 22, 2005 and either (i) withdraw the rejections and issue a notice of allowance or (ii) issue a new Office Action either citing new art or, in the event the Examiner maintains the same rejections, explicitly addressing each of the arguments presented in the Response filed April 22, 2005.

**SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

In a telephone interview on August 26, 2005 involving Applicant's representative, Robert Miller, Examiner Lee and Examiner Cao, currently pending claims 1-25, U.S. Patent No. 6,158,014 and the Office Action mailed July 6, 2005 were discussed. Applicant's representative pointed out that a response had been filed on April 22, 2005 traversing all the rejections and presenting arguments in support of the traversals for both independent and dependent claims. Applicant's representative further pointed out that the Office Action mailed July 6, 2005 merely repeated the rejections without taking note of and answering the substance of each of the arguments presented, as required under MPEP §707.07(f). Agreement was reached that (i) Applicant would file a request for reconsideration, (ii) the Examiner would withdraw the finality of the Office Action mailed July 6, 2005 and (iii) in the event the Examiner maintained the same rejection, the Examiner would explicitly address each of the arguments presented

in the remarks of the Response filed on April 22, 2005 (see Interview Summary, paper no. 20050826).


Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicant's representative should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge our office Account No. 50-0541.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert M. Miller  
Registration No. 42,892  
24840 Harper Avenue, Suite 100  
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080  
(586) 498-0670

Dated: September 6, 2005

Docket No.: 0325.00417